

### **IN THE DRAWINGS**

Please cancel sheet 3 of the formal patent drawings, as filed with the application and consisting of Fig. 3. Please substitute therefor Replacement Sheet 3 also consisting of Fig. 3, as enclosed. Please also add New Sheet 8 consisting of new Fig. 8, as also enclosed.

## **REMARKS**

Applicants, their principal representatives in Germany, and the undersigned have carefully reviewed the first Office Action of October 5, 2006 in the subject U.S. patent application, in which the time for response is concurrently being requested to be extended for one month, together with the prior art cited and relied on by the Examiner in the rejections of the claims. In response, the Substitute Specification, drawings and claims of the subject application, as filed, have been amended. It is believed that the claims now pending in the application are patentable over the prior art references cited and relied on by the Examiner, taken either singly or in combination. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

In the first Office Action of October 5, 2006 in the subject U.S. patent application, the Examiner objected to the drawings, as filed with the application, as having several informalities. It was noted that reference numeral 17 and its associated lead line were shown somewhat incorrectly in Fig. 3. In response, there is submitted herewith a Replacement Sheet in which the location of reference numeral 17 and its associated lead line have been corrected in Fig. 3 to agree with the description in the Substitute

Specification and in the other drawing figures. This correction does not constitute any new matter.

The drawings were objected to as failing to show the arrangement of six dressings arranged side-by-side in the axial direction of the cylinder and the arrangement of two dressings arranged in the circumferential direction of the cylinder, as recited in claims 32 and 33, respectively. In response a New Sheet of drawings which consists of Fig. 8 is being submitted. This new drawing figure is a depiction of the cylinder arrangement which is described in detail at paragraph 019 of the Substitute Specification, and which is recited in claims 32 and 33 of the claims set forth in the Preliminary Amendment, which is part of the application, as filed. The addition of new Fig. 8 of the drawings does not constitute any new matter. Its submission overcomes the Examiner's objection to the drawings in this regard.

The Substitute Specification of the application, as filed, has been carefully reviewed, in accordance with the Examiner's request. Several minor typographical errors have been noted and corrected. The Description of the Drawings section has been amended to add a description of newly submitted Fig. 8. In addition, paragraphs 019 and 033 have been amended to recite the existence of Fig. 8. It is believed that

these changes do not constitute any new matter.

Claims 32 and 33 were objected to as being improper dependent claims. In response, both of these claims have been cancelled. New claim 55 is essentially prior claim 30 written in independent form and claiming the combination of a device for changing a dressing on a cylinder, and the cylinder. It is believed that newly presented claim 55 is in proper form. Claim 32 has been cancelled. It now is dependent claim 56. Cancelled claim 33 has been rewritten as dependent claim 57. It is believed that the presentation of new independent claim 55 and the substitution of dependent claims 56 and 57 for objected to dependent claims 32 and 33 overcomes the Examiner's objection to these claims.

Claims 30-47 were objected to as having various informalities. In claim 30 the term "printing" has been changed to "pressing" in two occurrences. Those changes overcome the object to claim 30. Claim 33 has been cancelled, thus rendering that objection moot. In claims 35 the term "roll" has been cancelled. Claim 40 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Claim 44 has also been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Claim 46 has been amended to depend from claim 45. The last several lines of this claim have also been cancelled. It is believed that these various

changes to the claims overcome the Examiner's objections to the claims.

Claims 30-54 were rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. patent application No. 2004/0244615 to Herbert. Claims 30-33, 35 and 41-43 were rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. patent application No. 2005/0005793 to Schäfer. The Examiner asserted that the applicants cannot rely on the foreign priority papers filed in the subject application to overcome these rejections because a translation of those papers had not been made of record, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55.

In response, there is concurrently being submitted a verified translation of the certified copy of the German language text of German Application No. DE 102 38 177.1 filed August 21, 2002. There is also enclosed a German language copy of that certified document. The submission of that verified translation is believed to be sufficient, under 37 CFR 1.55(3)(ii) to allow applicants to rely on the August 21, 2002 filing date of the German priority application. The primary reference to Herbert, U.S. patent application No. 2004/0244615 corresponds to a PCT application filed on September 30, 2002, which filing date is itself after the filing date of the German priority application. However, in accordance with 35 USC 102(e), since the PCT application was published in

German, not English, the earliest date available for the Herbert document is the August 17, 2003 publication date of the PCT application, as WO 03/031179. That publication date is clearly after the German priority date of August 21, 2002 of the subject U.S. patent application. Accordingly, claims 30-54 are not anticipated by Herbert 2004/0244615.

The reference to Schäfer, U.S. patent application No. 2005/0005793 corresponds to a PCT application filed November 28, 2002 and published as WO 03/047863 on June 12, 2003. Both of those dates are subsequent to the August 21, 2002 filing date of the German priority application. The Schäfer reference is thus also not available as a reference. Claims 30-33, 35 and 41-43 are thus also not anticipated by this document.


## SUMMARY

The Substitute Specification, drawings and claims of the subject U.S. patent application, as filed, have been amended. A verified English language text of the German language certified priority document is being submitted concurrently. A one month extension of the time for response is being requested. It is believed that the claims now pending in the subject U.S. patent application are allowable over the prior art cited and relied on. Allowance of the claims, and passage of the application to issue is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Kurt Johannes WESCHENFELDER et al.  
Applicant

JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant

  
Douglas R. Hanscom  
Reg. No. 26, 600

January 9, 2007  
JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2266 Eads Station  
Arlington, Virginia 22202  
(703) 415-1500  
Attorney Docket: W1.2160 PCT-US